FMTV A1 CR DRAFT RFP

QUESTIONS WITH ANSWERS

SET C

14Jun 02

Question 9 Reference ATPD Page 25 Paragraph # 3.4.18

Title: Communication/Intelligence System Equipment

Statement: During the Phase I question and answer period prior to the Phase I proposal a number of questions were asked regarding the physical size, mounting interface, and mounting location for each of the pieces of radio equipment listed in paragraph 3.4.18. The answer that was eventually provided was that these radios and other systems such as Movement Tracking Systems (MTS) were to be mounted to the digitization rack mounted behind the passenger's seat.

In paragraph 3.2.9 it describes that there is to be seating for three personnel under normal circumstances and two when radio/radio mounts are installed. This would imply that the center occupant seat is displaced to mount the radio/radio mount if the digitization rack is not present. If the radios, however, are always mounted on the digitization rack, three passenger seating positions are always available.

Question 9A: What is the installation location for the radio/radio mount if a digitization rack kit is not installed? When will drawings of this other radio/radio mount be provided?

Answer 9A: *The radio mounting kit is mounted to the floor of the cab in the area where the center seat is normally located. NSN's for full-up FMTV SINCGARS installation kits are 5895-01-421-0814 for single-unit kits (P/N 80063-A3157864), and 5895-01-421-0812 for dual-unit kits (P/N 80063-A3157645).*

The SINCGARS installation kits are CECOM controlled part numbers, however the drawings should be accessible through ACMS. If for some reason an Offeror cannot access them electronically, please contact the PCO.

Question 9B: If this location is left up to the end user, will either 3.4.18 or 3.2.9 be revised to describe this method of incorporation and/or define the space claim required?

Answer 9B: *No, see Answer 9A above.*

Question 9C: If the intent is to always make use of the digitization rack to mount radios and other electronic components, will 3.4.18 or 3.2.9 be revised to correct the statement regarding seating positions?

Answer 9C: *No revisions to 3.4.18 or 3.2.9 will be made, as not all vehicles will receive the digitization kit and the above identified mounting kits will still be used on some vehicles.*

Question 9D: Where are antenna bases for the radio(s) to be mounted on the vehicle? Please confirm that the antenna location has been validated to fit within the width requirements defined by 3.2.2.1 / 4.7.18 / 6.3.17.

Answer 9D: *The radio kits identified in Answer 9A above include antenna mounting brackets, which are located at both upper rear corners of the cab on the side walls. These antenna mounting brackets may have to be removed/stowed to meet the full transportability requirements called out. Please note however that the radio mounting kits are field-installed kits, not installed by the OEM.*

Question 23, Reference ATPD Page 13 Paragraph # 3.2.2.3.2

Title: Protective Coatings

Statement: This paragraph requires that rust preventative compounds are to be applied to areas approved by the Government. The baseline trucks received as part of the Phase I effort, had some type of preventative compound applied to a number of areas inside the cab such as below the fixed rear windows, inside the door shell, and in between the roof inner and outer structure. This application, however, is not documented by any of the drawings or other documents received in the TDP.

Question 23A: Has the application of the specific preventative materials been mandated by the Government to meet the corrosion life requirements of the vehicle? If so, please provide the necessary documentation that defines the properties of these materials.

Answer 23A: *The information has been incrementally incorporated into the TDP. There is no one particular drawing or set of drawings addressing "Corrosion Preventive Materials". The corrosion preventive materials are called out on the drawings for the particular assemblies/subassemblies to which they are applied .*

Question 23B: Is there a drawing or a document that defines where these rust proofing compounds are to be applied to the vehicle? If so, can a copy of this document or drawing be provided?

Answer 23B: *See Answer 23 A above.*

Question 24, Reference ATPD Page 13 Paragraph # 3.2.2.3.3
Title: Corrosion Control Performance

Statement: The baseline accelerated corrosion test provided in Phase I as Attachment 25 was conducted on two M1078A1 LMTV Cargo vehicles. There are several vehicles such as the M1087A1 Expansible Van and the M1089A1 Wrecker that incorporate numerous crevice geometry locations that are prone to corrosion initiation sites. There are also portions of the M1089A1 wrecker under lift and tow spade assembly that are not defined by the TDP, therefore no direct corrosion review can be performed. The M1090A1 and M1094A1 dump variants contain a dump bed that will constantly have its interior abraded by aggregates, blast rock and construction waste such as reinforced concrete. The AR400F material incorporated into the floor and walls of the dump bed affords reasonable corrosion and abrasion resistance. This material is widely used in commercial dump applications. From our experience, commercial dump truck beds, rarely last more that 10 years without extensive repair or replacement.

Question 24A: How will the corrosion life requirement be evaluated on the M1087A1CR, M1089A1CR, M1090A1CR, and M1094A1CR vehicles?

Since it is impractical to constantly repaint the interior of the dump bed for cost and environmental reasons, will the visible corrosion requirements be relaxed to permit visible oxidation and limited pitting on the M1090A1 and M1094A1 dump variants?

Answer 24A: *No evaluation of the corrosion life of the identified FMTV variants will be pursued at this time, with the exception of any Contractor Phase I ECPs that affect the above identified variants in addition to the variants tested during Phase I.*

Question 24B: Will the corrosion life requirements for the dump beds be relaxed from the 22-year requirement given abrasive requirements, limited coating repair, and potential water accumulation if the bed is not stored in a slightly raised position to prevent the accumulation of water in the bed?

If not, can the Government provide guidance to both competitors regarding life expectations of dump beds in their current operational fleets?

Answer 24B: *Please refer to Answer 24A above. Being as the M1090A1 and M1094A1 were not addressed under Phase I, no ECPs peculiar to those variants are expected to be submitted under Phase II. As such, no evaluation of the corrosion life of the dump bodies, which are not peculiar solely to the dump variants, will be pursued. Therefore, no relaxation of the 22-year corrosion life for the dump beds will be entertained, as long as the dump bodies are produced in accordance with the TDP. Validation of dump body conformance to the 22-year corrosion life requirement will occur if the dump variants*

are chosen at some point during the production contract for an Accelerated Corrosion Test (ACT). If at that point deficiencies are identified, correction of those deficiencies will be pursued under a Government-funded STS effort.

Question 26, Reference ATPD Page 13 Paragraph # 3.2.2.3.4

Title: Vehicle Corrosion Evaluation

Statement: The vehicle shall be tested and evaluated by conducting a destructive Government approved accelerated corrosion durability test at a Government facility. The test criteria and procedure is defined by Attachment 9 of the Draft RFP. This document refers to characteristics that are present on a cargo vehicle without a winch or a crane.

Question 26A: Will the corrosion test vehicle be aM1078A1, a M1083A1, or a M1085A1, since no characteristics present on other variants are referenced in Attachment 9?

Answer 26A: *The corrosion test vehicle(s) may be any of the variants being purchased under this contract. These may include variants that have or have not previously been subjected to an Accelerated Corrosion Test (ACT). In the event an MHE-equipped, or other untested, variant(s) is/are selected for testing during any of the optional ACT(s), Attachment 9 will be updated by a joint Government/Contractor Team to address items peculiar to the variant to be selected prior to actual selection of the vehicle for test. If during test deficiencies are identified, correction of those deficiencies will be pursued under a Government-funded STS effort as described in the response to 24B above.*

Question 26B: Will the test procedure be amended to evaluate criteria for features such as a winch, crane, or other body variant if something other than a standard cargo truck is selected?

Answer 26B: *Yes, see Answer 26A above.*

Question 26C: If any deficiencies are noted during this corrosion test on production variants that haven't been through this test before, will these issues be remedied via an STS design/retrofit effort funded by the Government or is it the responsibility of the competitor?

Answer 26C: *Remedies, if pursued, to any deficiencies identified during an ACT will be a result of an STS design/retrofit effort funded by the Government*

Question 27, Reference ATPD Page 25 Paragraph # 3.4.17

Title: Rifle Mount

Statement: The FMTV baseline incorporates a new configuration rifle storage system as defined by ECP SSS-U5771 that features a spring-loaded clip to secure the barrel of the weapon. It is also adjustable up and down to adapt to longer weapons such as the M16A2 and shorter weapons such as the M4 that has a collapsible stock. Based on a physical inspection performed with a M16A2 weapon simulator, there is barely enough vertical roof height available to store the weapon on the baseline cab. This installation would not accommodate the additional devices such as the Blank adapter and the MILES adapter due to an interference with the roof panel on the cab. This length consideration is not an issue on the M4 weapon since it features a collapsible stock and a shorter barrel.

There was recently a headliner installed in the baseline cab configuration (ref ECP SSS-U5784) which further reduces the vertical space available between the lower storage brackets and the roof of the cab.

Question 27A: Was a physical inspection ever performed to validate that the M16A2, with either the Blank adapter or the MILES adapter, could be stored in the baseline cab shell that incorporates both the new rifle mount and the headliner?

If yes, can documentation and/or pictures depicting this condition be provided?

If no, will the Government perform this validation on a cab with the new weapon storage racks, the headliner, and a M16A2 rifle with either the Blank or MILES adapter present and make the results availabel to the FMTVA1CR bidders?

Answer 27A: *The headliner and weapons mount were developed under STS during the same timeframe. As such, fit-up tests were conducted during development of those kits to identify and resolve any interference between the headliner and the accessory-equipped rifles. As a result of a noted interference, the cutouts in the rear edge of the headliner LH and RH sections were introduced. Fit-up tests performed after the headliner cutouts were introduced identified no interference between the headliner and the accessory-equipped rifles; the cutouts had resolved the problem and were incorporated into the design approved by the Government and introduced into the TDP by ECP SSSU5784 and SSSU5784R1.*

Question 27B: Assuming that this validation confirms that the M16A2 with the Blank adapter or MILES adapter cannot be installed in the cab, will paragraph 3.4.17 be revised to eliminate this requirement for the M16A2 weapon?

Answer 27B: *Please see Answer 27A above.*

Question 29, Reference ATPD Page 63 Paragraph # A.1

Title: Cargo

Statement: This paragraph refers to two MTV cargo variants with MHE (M1084A1/M1086A1) and two cargo variants without (M1083A1/M1085A1).

Question 29A: Will Annex A be revised to incorporate the unique requirements for the M1084A1/RSV or the HIMARS resupply vehicle?

Answer 29A: *No, those variants will be addressed in separate annexes that will be included in the revised specification accompanying the final RFP.*

Question 29B: If the M1084A1/RSV requirements are not added to this Annex, will a new Annex be added to the FMTV purchase description?

Answer 29B: *Yes, see Answer 29A above.*

Question 29C: Will the LHS truck requirements be incorporated into Annex A since it is a variant that replaces some existing MTV cargo's or will a unique Annex be added to the FMTV purchase description?

Answer 29C: *No, LHS truck requirements will be addressed by a separate annex that will be included in the upgraded specification accompanying the final RFP.*

Question 31, Reference ATPD, Paragraph # A.3.3.3, A.4.4, A.4.4.3

Title: Crane Hydraulic System and Controls, MTV Crane Check/Test/Certification, Crane Hydraulic System and Control Tests

Statement: The cited paragraphs indicate that no leaks are allowed. In a battlefield mission environment, historically, Class I and Class II leaks have been allowed, and in certain instances, depending on the rate of fluid loss and reservoir capacity, some Class III leaks have been allowed. The current requirement is not reflective of the flexibility needed to operate equipment in a wartime environment when the equipment is truly mission capable.

Question 31: Would the Government consider including a statement to relax the existing requirement to allow the flexibility needed to operate the equipment in a wartime environment?

Answer 31: *No. Requirements reflect peacetime use of the vehicles. Any relaxation of those requirements during wartime use will be at the discretion of the operating Unit Commander.*

Question 35, Reference Draft RFP Section C, Paragraph # C.1.5

Title: FMTV Technical Data Package/3D Solid Model

Statement: It is stated that the Government will provide 3-D models for baseline vehicles and that the contractor will submit their changes in certain specified days after contract.

Question 35A: Can the Government amend the following 240DAC/300DAC to include "or 240/300 Days *after receipt of the Government baseline models, whichever is the later date*?"

Answer 35A: *No, Government models will be provided prior to release of the final RFP. If, for whatever reason, they are not available by that time, the Government will reconsider the suggested change.*

Question 35B: If errors are found in the Government models, will the Government correct the errors and extend the delivery date requirements for the contractor deliverables?

Answer 35B: *Yes, but only if the changes result from significant errors. If significant errors are found the Government will make corrections and the contract delivery dates will be adjusted accordingly.*

Question 42, Reference ATPD, Page 12 Paragraph # 3.2.1.15

Title: Approach and Departure Angles

Statement: Paragraph 3.2.1.15 of the ATPD states, "The departure angle of the basic cargo trucks, with and without kits and with and without winch, shall be a minimum of 40°."

The following departure angles are found in FMTV product literature, the M1084A1 Cargo has a departure angle of 36°, the M1085A1 LWB Cargo has a departure angle of 20°, the M1086A1 LWB Cargo with MHE has a departure angle of 21°, and the M1087A1 Expansible Van has a departure angle of 17°.

The M1085A1, M1086A1 and M1087A1 contain a bumper/understructure that does not meet these FMVSS 223/FMCSR 224 requirements. These requirements are not directly applicable to the majority of FMTV variants since they are not either a trailer or semi-

trailer and any change in this area would adversely affect the angle of departure for the vehicles.

Question 42A: Please confirm that underride protection is not applicable to the FMTV truck variants.

Answer 42A: *The Offeror shall provide underride protection to the maximum extent possible. Where the mobility constraints conflict with the FMVSS requirements, mobility shall take precedence.*

Question 42B: If it is a requirement, departure angles will change. Is this acceptable?

Answer 42B: *No, as stated in 42A, mobility takes precedence. Departure angles shall remain IAW the ATPD.*

Question 43, Reference ATPD, Page 21 Paragraph # 3.4.5.2

Title: Wheels, Rims and Tires

Statement: The wheel/tire assemblies used on the LMTV/MTV trucks are the same as the wheel/tire assemblies used on the M1082/M1095 trailers. The only possible exception of this is the termination of the CTIS hoses when the wheel assemblies are installed on the trailers since it is not equipped with CTIS. It is therefore possible to interchange a wheel/tire assembly from the truck to the trailer if necessary.

The tires used on the LHS trailer are 275/70R22.5 (Ref P/N 12486614) which are noticeably different from the 395/85R20 (Ref P/N 12378858) tires used on the existing trucks and trailers. Similarly, the LHS trailer wheels 22.5x8.5 (Ref P/N 12486616) are noticeably different from the standard wheels P/N 12417333 used on the baseline truck and trailers. Another fundamental difference is that the wheels used on the baseline trucks/trailers are two piece wheels that can accommodate bead locks. This is not possible on the LHS trailers single piece wheels. As a result the tire pressure cannot be significantly reduced on the LHS trailer without risking the tire bead unseating from the rim and causing a flat.

Question 43A: Will the requirements for paragraph 3.4.5.2 be revised to eliminate the LHS trailer from this requirement?

Answer 43A: *Any LHS truck- and/or trailer-peculiar requirements will be addressed in the appropriate LHS truck or LHS trailer Annex that will be in the revised specification accompanying the final RFP. However, it should be noted that the FMTV trailer shares the wheel/rim/CTIS features of its prime mover to act as emergency spares. There are no*

requirements to inflate/deflate FMTV trailer tires for any applications. There will be no requirement for the LHS trailer to have CTIS capability.

Question 43B: If no, will the Government allow the competitors to propose an ECP to change the axles, wheels, and tires used on the LHS trailer to conform to the requirements of 3.4.5.2?

Answer 43B: *See Answer 43A above.*

Question 43C: Will the wheel/tire assemblies used on the LHS trailer need to be changed to support the bead locks required to support the lower tire pressures required with off-road operation?

Answer 43C: *See Answer 43A above.*

Question 44, Reference ATPD, Page 45 Paragraph # 4.7.12

Title: Mobility Test

Statement: This paragraph states that the mobility of the MTV Cargo and the LMTV Cargo will be determined via modeling to confirm compliance with 3.2.1.13.

It has been demonstrated that the baseline modeling as Attachments 26 and 27 do not meet the current performance requirements without some adjustment or "fudge factor". This was necessary to correlate the predicted results from modeling and simulation with actual test results determined from Waterways Experimental Station (WES) and ATC mobility testing.

Question 44A: How will the Government confirm that the modeling used to confirm compliance of this requirement is accurate?

Answer 44A: *The DADS and NRMM FMTV A1 models were not refined with actual test data and therefore are not completely representative of the FMTV A1. Since the model is not accurately predicting system performance, the Government will not make any evaluations based on the M&S results. The NRMM and DADS modeling will be used for trends analyses ((performance differences from the baseline model predictions) only. Compliance to the performance requirements will be determined solely through physical results measured during test.*

Question 44B: Will the same adjustments and/or "fudge factor", used to correlate the results of the baseline vehicle, be used in the analysis performed on the new configuration vehicles in the FMTV A1CR program?

Answer 44B: *The Government will incorporate the Offeror's design changes and run models to see how the performance has changed. The Government will not make any evaluation conclusions based on M&S results.*

Question 44C: What is the "fudge factor" and how is it developed?

Answer 44C: *There is no "fudge factor".*

Question 48, Reference ATPD, Page 75 Paragraph # C.3.1.1.1

Title: Roof

Statement: "C.3.1.1.1 Roof. The roof shall be capable of being walked on by a 95th percentile male (250 lbs) while broom clearing up to 6 inches of wet snow, without damage, prior to retracting the sides. Roof panels shall be secured to prevent panel vibration."

Question 48A: Is this requirement only applicable to the main van body roof (fixed center section) or does it also include the roof of the expanding wall sections?

Answer 48A*: This requirement is applicable to the main body roof only.*

Question 48B: Would there ever be a similar need to access the roof of the van body to deploy camouflage netting?

Answer 48B: *Yes, on main body roof.*

Question 48C: If deployment/removal of camouflage netting is a requirement, what is the additional weight of the netting camouflage kit?

Answer 48C: *We do not know how much the netting weighs.*

Question 48D: Can a single crew person deploy this netting or are more crew personnel required?

Answer 48D: *It can be done by one person.*

Question 54, Reference ATPD, Page 86 Paragraph # D.3.8

Title: Towed Vehicles

Statement: The following statement or test condition was moved to paragraph D.3.9, "Trailers may have the landing legs supported as required to attain the proper engagement height with the tractor." This statement is directly applicable to the towed vehicle compatibility requirement of paragraph D.3.8. It does not apply to the Trailer Brake Control System (semitrailer) of paragraph D.3.9.
Question 54: Will the following statement "Trailers may have the landing legs supported as required to attain the proper engagement height with the tractor." be removed from paragraph D.3.9 and returned to paragraph D.3.8?

Answer 54: *Yes. The revised specification that will accompany the final RFP will reflect this change.*

Question 55, Reference ATPD, Page 89 Paragraph # E.2.3.1b

Title: Lift/Towing

Statement: The M1089A1 wrecker is required to be able to lift and tow from the rear any of the vehicles listed in paragraph E.2.2 and any LMTV or MTV variant. There is also a disclaimer that the rear weight of a towed item cannot exceed either the front lift of a fully loaded FMTV.

Question 55A: Are there any known combinations, in the population of vehicles defined in paragraph E.2.2 or any LMTV/MTV fully loaded variants, that results in a weight reduction on the front axle of the M1089A1 that makes it potentially unsafe?

Answer 55A: *Yes, for 800- and 900- series trucks. The FMTV wrecker is approved for lift tow of the M809 and M939 cargo variants only.*

Question 55B: If there are any vehicles in the response to question A, are they required to be lifted and towed from the rear per paragraph E.2.3.1b?

Answer 55B: *No, front lift towing only is required for M809 and M939 cargo variants.*

Question 55C: Will any combinations applicable to the answer of Question B be removed from the FMTV vehicle specification requirements?

Answer 55C: *No, the spec will remain as currently stated.*

Question 55D: Is there any potential safety concern lifting and towing a M1089A1 with another M1089A1 from the rear, since the underlift mechanism of both vehicles would have to be used?

Answer 55D: *Recommend towing from the front (not to exceed 14,400 lbs. on the front stinger) or flat tow.*

Question 55E: If a concern is identified regarding the lift and tow of a M1089A1 from the rear with another M1089A1, will this requirement be removed from the FMTV specification?

Answer 55E: *Yes, rear lift and tow of the M1089 will be removed from the spec.*

Question 56, Reference ATPD, Paragraph # E.2.3.2.1

Title: Location and Capability

Statement: One portion of this requirement is the ability to lift standard shelters from an adjacent FMTV cargo vehicle. The M1089A1 crane appears to have the required lifting capacity, boom length and boom angle to accomplish this requirement.

Question 56A: Is the standard sling provided with the M1089A1 capable of interfacing with the shelter or is an alternate sling required for lifting standard shelters?

Answer 56A: *The standard sling is not capable of interfacing with the shelter and an alternate sling is required.*

Question 56B: If an alternate sling is required for this operation, or to lift other power pack combinations, is this considered an Additional Authorized Item (AAI) that is not required to be provided on the truck and no dedicated storage location needs to be provided?

Answer 56B: *The alternate sling is not an AAI for the wrecker and, therefore, requires no dedicated stowage location*.

Question 57, Reference ATPD, Page 105 Paragraph # E.3.1.2

Title: Transportability

Statement: This paragraph requires that "The van body shall be transportable as specified in the main body of the portion of the FMTV Specification. The body shall have lifting provisions which allow for the installation and removal of the body to and from the chassis if necessary for air transport."

It should also be noted that the LMTV Van body has to be removed for other modes of transport. For example, the M1079A1 and M1087A1 Van bodies would have to be removed to meet the rail transport tunnel opening requirements for the GIC, NATO Envelope B, Korean, and AAR tunnel profiles as defined by MIL-STD-1366 and FMTV

ATPD paragraph 3.2.8.4. Only the M1087A1 has the necessary lift and tie down provisions on the van body to accommodate separate shipment. The height of the M1079A1/M1087A1 van bodies may have to be reduced or special route planning utilized if the vehicles are to be shipped via semitrailer.

The next difficulty is that the M1079A1 van body does not have the correct floor interface to permit it to be loaded/unloaded to/from a C-130/C-141 aircraft via the roller system in the aircraft and on a 25K, 40K or 60K-Loader. As a result, the van must be shipped on a 463L series of cargo pallets. Given the weight of the item and the limited contact area, shoring materials would have to be used between the van body and the 463L pallets. The only provisions available to secure the van down are the lifting provision located at the upper edge of the front and rear walls on the van body.

Question 57A: Will the transportability requirements defined by H.3.1.2 or 3.2.8.4 be revised to reflect the additional rail tunnel profiles that the M1079A1 and M1087A1 are not compliant with?

Answer 57A: *Yes, the transportability requirements defined by H.3.1.2 or 3.2.8.4 will be revised to reflect the additional rail tunnel profiles that the M1079A1 and M1087A1 are not compliant with.*

Question 57B: Do tie down provisions need to be added to the lower edge of the M1079A1 van body to facilitate the item being secured during internal air transport on a C-130/C-141 aircraft, during highway shipment on a trailer if removed from the chassis, or rail transport if the body is removed?

Answer 57B: *No, the current van configuration already meets this requirement. Caution plate on van body references the TM's for tiedown procedures prior to shipping.*

Question 57C: Do the current lifting provisions for the M1079A1 van body need to be certified to MIL-STD-209H since they are used for item slinging and tie down in C-130/C-141 aircraft?

Answer 57C: *Yes.*

Question 57D: What is the maximum shipping weight of the M1079A1 van body with all option kits installed and full permissible payload/equipment?

Answer 57D: *Approximate weight for the M1079A1 van body is 9,850-10,000 lbs (Max).*

Question 60, Reference Draft RFP Section L, Paragraph # L.2.2

Statement: Volume 1-Executive Summary (Subpart of Attachment 18).

"...The Offeror shall provide a summary of all their proposed changes to the Government FMTV A1 baseline configuration (IAW L.2.2.2.1) that they may wish to incorporate in their Contractor's baseline configuration continuing with the same ECP numbering methodology including continuing initial numbers and revision numbers as was done under the Phase 1 contract. All changes to a Contractor ECP introduced or proposed during Phase I which were not formally incorporated into the previously submitted ECP shall be rolled into the next revision number and submitted with the Phase II proposal. For example, if the Contractor's ECP going into test is at Revision 1 and 2 TWADs were authorized during Phase I testing, these changes will be captured in Revision 2 and submitted with the Phase II proposal. If a Contractor previously withdrew an ECP or decides to withdraw an ECP, it should also be annotated on the list."

Question 60A: Does this mean that only ECP's where items have changed, either on the GFE trucks or for Future Production Intent are to be formally resubmitted IAW Attachment 6?

Answer 60B: *No. All ECPs proposed for Phase II, whether they have been revised or not, must be submitted.*

Question 60B: Do the ECPs that have not changed only get recorded on "the list" (Attachment 18 ECP Matrix)?

Answer 60B: *No. A complete ECP package is required, even when there have been no changes to the Phase I submittal.*

Question 60C: Do the ECP's that are withdrawn because of integration issues only get represented as "Withdrawn" on Attachment 18 Matrix...or submitted as a revision to the ECP with the proposal?

Answer 60C: If an ECP is withdrawn for any reason it is simply withdrawn. Notice to the Government of the withdrawal should, however, be provided per paragraph L.2.2. If a Gov't ECP causes an interface issue the Offeror may submit a revised ECP (R*) to remedy the condition.

Question 62, Reference Draft RFP Section L, Paragraph L.5.1

Question 62:Volume 4 - Supporting Data

It appears TACOM wants all ECPs and all supporting data included in this section, then...later in the paragraph...it leads us to think that we will submit supporting documentation to ECPs for revisions covered under this ECP and solid models...Do we submit all of the ECPs or only those that have changed since our final Phase I submittal?

Answer 62: *Yes, your interpretation is correct; the Government wants all ECPs and all supporting data included in this section.*

Question 68, Reference ATPD 2131C, Paragraph A.2.1

Question 68: ATPD 2131C (like version B before) says to provide

A.2.1. Cargo Bed Tiedowns. The cargo body shall have tiedowns, conforming to MIL-STD-209H, except the cargo tiedown locations shall be in accordance with the technical data package provided with this solicitation. Tiedowns shall swivel 360^{o} and shall not protrude above the floor or side wall level when they are not in use. The rings must be accessible when the drop sides are in raised position. No portion of the bed shall fail when maximum rated load is placed on any opposing tiedowns.

We suggest A.2.1 of the ATPD 2131C specification should be tailored as follows:

Cargo Bed Tiedowns. The cargo body shall have tiedowns, conforming to MIL-STD-209H, except the cargo tiedown locations shall be in accordance with the technical data package provided with this solicitation. *Tie down locations may be adjusted and/or added as necessary to avoid vehicle structural members and meet performance requirements for lifting and slinging provisions of MIL-STD-209H.* Tiedowns shall swivel 360^{o} and shall not protrude above the floor or sidewall level when they are not in use. The rings must be accessible when the drop sides are in raised position. No portion of the bed shall fail when maximum rated load is placed on any opposing tiedowns.

This new language addresses the LWB MHE cargo bed requirements.

Answer 68: *Nonconcur with the proposed change. Cargo tiedown locations were validated under Phase 1. No evidence has been provided to suggest an interference issue in the M1086 A1.*

Question 69, Reference ATPD 2131C, Paragraph 3.2.8.4

Statement: 3.2.8.4 Rail. All vehicle variants (except Van body) shall be designed to meet the dimensional requirements of the Gabarit International de Chargement when loaded on 50 in (127 cm) high European flatcars. The vehicle at both GVW and GCW (GVW only for tractor and wrecker) less crew weight shall withstand without damage or degradation a military standard rail impact test (paragraph 4.7.31.5) with heaviest pintle-towed load attached.

Question 69A: This change from ATPD 2131 B (ATPD 2131 B only required GVW) would require a strength increase in the truck tiedowns except for the Tractor/Wrecker. The implication to the trailer would be also be an increase in strength. In addition, frame/pintle/lunette analysis is required to verify no domino design effect. We would, of course, require contractor testing prior to Gov't test submittal. This implication is significant and appears to be a change in transportation requirements. While a successful design is feasible, is this your intent?

Answer 69A: *Yes, this is our intent. This change is driven by a pending revision to the Operational Requirements Document (ORD).*

Question 69B: Only 4 tiedown points are allowed by MIL-STD-209H based on Gross Weight (GW).

Does GW mean GCW and/or GVW within MIL-STD-209H?

Answer 69B: *GVW of each unit. 4 tiedowns are to be used on each unit, i.e. 4 tiedowns on the truck, 4 tiedowns on the trailer. Per MTMC/TEA direction, each unit will be tied down as if it were being transported as a separate unit.*

Question 70 Reference ATPD 2131C, Paragraph 3.2.1.7

Question 70: Reference: 3.2.1.7 Fording

The referenced paragraph states that "without preparation" the vehicle shall be able to ford 30 inches.

The current application has a switch on the dash that must be toggled by a crewmember for anything deeper than 20 inches as further defined by the caution plate on the dash.

Does this meet the "without preparation" requirement?

Answer 70: Yes, *this is acceptable, as it does not require any pause in vehicle operations to accomplish the action.*

Question 72, Reference ATPD, Paragraph # 3.4.14.4

Title: Wiring

Statement: "Chassis junction boxes shall be furnished at multiple disconnect points." The baseline vehicle, with the exception of the M1079A1/M1087A1 vans, have no external junction boxes. Connections are accomplished via weather proof/sealed connectors with the exception of the power distribution panel located in the cab.

Question 72A: Which variants and at what locations would these junction boxes be required?

Answer 72A: *Para 3.4.14.4 to be revised to read "... Chassis junction boxes (If required) shall....". Currently only the vans require junction boxes and these requirements are covered in Annexes C and H.*

Question 72B: If this is an implied requirement applicable if a different wiring configuration is required, at what level of NEMA protection would be required?

Answer 72B: *N/A*

Question 72C: If this requirement is only applicable to the van variants, wouldn't the requirements of Annex C and Annex H be appropriate?

Answer 72C: *See 72A above.*

Question 73, Reference ATPD, Paragraph # 4.7.73

Title: Instrument Check

Statement: The baseline indicator display range, P/N 12422186, was revised to incorporate several new features/indicators as part of the limp home change SSS-U5788. The required controls and indicators are defined by paragraph 3.4.10 (FMVSS 101/MIL-HDBK-1271) with the exception of those specifically identified as exceptions in that paragraph. Paragraph 4.7.73 requires that a front wheel drive indicator (if not full time) be provided.

Question 73: Since this indicator is not present on the baseline vehicle and the truck is designed to be all wheel drive, can the requirement for a front wheel drive indicator be removed from 4.7.73?

Answer 73: *No, the requirement will remain as written. Due to full-time all-wheel-drive, the front-wheel-drive indicator light is not required on vehicles built per the approved TDP. Specification takes precedence, by contract and ATPD, over the TDP. Change to the specification will be in the final RFP.*

Question 74, Reference ATPD, Paragraph # C.1.2.3

Title: Contractor Phase II Proposed Changes (Attachment 18)

Statements: "1) Contractor may have proposed new changes as necessary to meet added requirements contained in ATPD 2131C (Attachment 1)…."
"3) Contractor Phase I changes which had to be modified or withdrawn because of interface issues related to new Government ECPs (Attachment 3) incorporated into the TDP since Phase I configured vehicles were tested."

Question 74: Does statement #3 mean that the New Government ECP's takes full precedence over contractor proposed changes if there is an interface issue? Meaning that the Government approved parts can not be removed or modified in any way?

Alternatively, is the contractor allowed to propose a new ECP, under statement #1, for an alternative solution to remedy the interface issue since the new Government ECPs become requirements as a part of the baseline TDP?

Answer 74: The *new Government ECPs do not necessarily take full precedence. The intent of this paragraph is to allow competitors to withdraw or modify existing ECPs to accommodate revisions necessary to resolve interface issues with the new Government ECPs. Contractor is not permitted to submit a completely new, unique ECP to remedy an interface problem. Only modification of an existing contractor proposed change or return to the baseline is permitted, under this circumstance.*

Question 81, Reference ATPD, Page 86 Paragraph # D.3.8

Title: Towed Vehicles

Statement:
This paragraph requires the FMTV tractor to be compatible with all of the trailers currently used with the M931 & M932 truck tractors. It also includes several trailers or recent versions of existing trailers that were not previously required. The compatibility of a reasonable number of these were defined by a portion of the 1995 FMTV Production Qualification Test (PQT) that was supplied as part of the Phase I - FMTV A1CR contract as Attachment 50.

At no time during the FMTV A1CR program have the specific characteristics or details for the trailers listed in Paragraph D.3.8 been provided so an interface analysis can be performed. As a result, the only documentation available to confirm/deny the compatibility is the excerpt from the test report (Attachment 50) in Table 2.11-10. It is unclear whether or not the footnote references listed adjacent to each line of trailer models is applicable to the trailer model immediately adjacent or to all trailers in that row.

Question 81A:
Will interface characteristics for the following trailers be provided to the competitors so they can conduct an analysis of tractor/trailer compatibility?

M118A1, M119A1, M129A4, M131A4C, M146, M295A1, M447, M447C, M750, M822, M991, M995, M1006, M1063, M1098, MILVAN, 40' and SEGPRSM

Answer 81A: *Characteristics sheets for the listed trailer will be provided with the final RFP.*

Question 81B: Are the exceptions listed beneath the list of trailers more specific of the reason that the M146, M822, M995, and MILVAN trailers were incompatible than the descriptions provided in Table 2.11-10 of Attachment 50?

Answer 81B: *Yes, the list of exceptions (footnotes) at the end of the table in Paragraph D.3.8 is more specific than those following Table 2.11.10 of Attachment 50 of the Phase I contract.*

Question 81C: If the interface characteristics for the trailers listed in Question A are not provided for review, will either a test report or a document that summarizes whether or not these trailers are compatible with the M1088A1 tractor be provided?

Answer 81C: *N/A See Answer 81A above.*

Question 81D: Will a document be provided that summarizes the operational compatibility for the trailers in paragraph D.3.8, since the only information provided is whether or not the trailer coupling is compatible with the M1088A1 tractor?

Answer 81D: *N/A. See Answer 81A above.*

Question 81E: If no trailer characteristics, coupling compatibility or operational compatibility confirmations are supplied to the competitors, will any deficiency noted during a future evaluation by considered a condition that the successful Phase II offeror is not responsible for and will be resolved through a funded STS effort?

Answer 81E: *N/A. See Answer 81A above.*

Question 82, Reference ATPD, Page 89 Paragraph # E.2.3.1

Title: Lift/Towing

Statement:
This paragraph states that "The wrecker shall lift and tow the vehicles as specified below without damage or permanent deformation to the wrecker of the towed vehicle."

This requirement is applicable to the heaviest FMTV variant, which is the M1088A1 tractor/trailer combination at Gross Combination Weight (GCW). The testing performed during the FMTV Production Verification Test identified a problem while towing the M1088/M871A2 combination (Ref . paragraph 2.12.5a). Lift and tow of this combination resulted in damage to the tow adapters on the underlift of the wrecker.

During the question and answer period of FMTV A1CR Phase I, the question was raised if the payload on the trailer could be reduced. The answer was that that was not an option. Based on another question from the Phase I RFP, the corrective action added the following caution note to the TM, "Do not flat tow a fully loaded MTV and trailer combination. The FMTV Wrecker towbar can be damaged if the weight capacity is exceeded. When towing a vehicle with non-functional brakes, use extreme caution and reduce/adjust accordingly."

Question 82A: Were there any changes to the M1089A1 wrecker underlift/towbar system or the tow adapters to address these issues?

Answer 82A: *It appears the offeror may have misinterpreted the ATPD paragraph. Paragraph E.2.3.1.a requires lift/tow of the specified vehicles loaded at up to the GVW of the heaviest FMTV variant. The use of GVW precludes towing a loaded tractor/trailer combination. Paragraph E.2.3.1.c requires towing only (all wheels on the ground) of the identified vehicles with trailers/semitrailers attached up to the GCW of the heaviest FMTV variant on relatively hard, level roads. In this paragraph, the cautionary note not to flat tow a fully loaded pertains to the MTV cargo variant and attendant trailer, not the tractor/semi-trailer combination.*

Question 82B: If no change can be confirmed, due to the proprietary nature of the underlift system, and no additional testing was performed, how can the competitors be sure that some form of design change is still not required?

Answer 82B: *N/A. See Answer 82A above.*

Question 82C
Will any documentation be provided to confirm that the configuration depicted in the TDP meets the performance requirements of E.2.3.1?

Answer 82C: N/A. See Answer 82A above.

Question 83, Reference ATPD, Page 105 Paragraph # H.3.1.5

Title: Rear Steps

Statement: The requirements for the fold down steps P/N 12421603 of the rear of the LMTV Van body are not specific other than to provide access to the roof. The expansible van body has similar requirements that are defined by paragraph C.3.1.1.7.2 of the FMTV A1 ATPD. One assumption is that the access to the roof is required to remove snow or to attach sling legs to the lifting provisions.

Question 83A: Are the roof strength requirements for the LMTV Van body the same as the Expansible Van body (ref C.3.1.1.1)?

Answer 83A: *Yes, the roof requirements for the LMTV Van Body are the same as those for the Expansible Van. A new paragraph will be incorporated into Annex H of the revised specification, which will accompany the final RFP, to clearly convey this.*

Question 83B: If the roof access provisions need to be supplied and the configuration is to be as depicted in the provided TDP, will the procuring agency state that the roof access provisions on the M1079A1 Van body do not have to conform to the requirements of MIL-STD-1472 and applicable CFR standards?

Answer 83B: *No. No relief is specified in Annex H. The LMTV Van must meet all Human Factors requirements imposed by paragraph 3.3.5.1 in the main body of ATPD 2131C.*

Question 84, Reference ATPD, Page 108 Paragraph # H.3.2.8

Title: Air Conditioner

Statement: This paragraph requires that "The van shall be provided with an externally-mounted air conditioner conforming to Top Assembly Drawing TA13222E9160, Model F18H-3SB, NSN 4120-00-974-7206 or equivalent."

The TDP lists air conditioning as a kit for M1079A1 on drawing 12422040. The kit P/N 57K1947 refers to the same air conditioner listed in paragraph H.3.2.8 by NSN.

At the viewing of both of the FMTV van variants, the M1079A1 viewed was one without an air conditioner. When queried, a statement was made that the air conditioner was an optional kit.

The air conditioner kit is not listed as a kit applicable to this contract (ref. Section C, paragraph C.1.3.3)

Question 84A: Is the air conditioner kit required to be supplied with every M1079A1 LMTV Van supplied on this contract?

Answer 84A: *The air conditioner system shall be installed at vehicle assembly. The Government will not provide either the air conditioner or installation kit as GFE.*

Question 84B: Will Top Assembly Drawing TA13222E9160, Model F18H-3SB, be supplied to both competitors since is was not included in the TDP provided?

Answer 84B: *As stated in Answer 84A above, the correct drawing is TA 13229E4200 (CAGE Code 97403). It is available on the TACOM ACMS system. Enter the request as drawing number 13229E4200, CAGE Code 97403.*

Question 87, Reference ATPD, Paragraph # 3.2.1.12.3

Title: Blackout Condition Lighting

Statement: The blackout lighting conditions defined by this paragraph does not define if the electric horn is to be or not be operable in blackout mode (tactical conditions). The electric horn, audible alarms in the cab and primary lighting is required to be disabled in blackout mode. The baseline FMTV does not incorporate these features.

Question 87: Does the electrical system need to be revised to disable the horn and audible alarms in the cab while in blackout mode?

Answer 87: *No, operability of the horn and audible alarm during blackout mode operations is required.*

Question 88, Reference ATPD, Page 15 Paragraph # 3.2.8.4

Title: Rail

Statement: This paragraph requires "All vehicle variants (except the van body) shall be designed to meet the dimensional requirements of the Gabrait International de Chargement when loaded on 50 in (127 cm) high European flatcars."

Given that the M1079A1 and M1087A1 van variants cannot meet the tunnel profile requirements with the exception of most CONUS rail tunnels, it has to be assumed that either the van body is removed from the chassis or special routes are utilized. If the van bodies are removed and shipped separately, only the M1087A1 van body incorporates the necessary slinging and tie down to support this mode of transport.

Question 88A: Do the lifting provisions on the M1079A1 van body and the lift and tie down provisions on the M1087A1 van body have to meet the strength and opening requirements of MIL-STD-209H?

Answer 88A: *Yes*

Question 88B: How is the M1079A1 van body secured to either a rail car or trailer?

Answer 88B: *The van body has sling/tiedown provisions at the upper four corners. Tiedown is IAW standard procedures identified in MTMC PAM 55-19.*

Question 88C: If the separate van bodies are required to meet the MIL-STD-209H requirements, will a separate provision test and rail impact test required to be performed?

Answer 88C: *There is no current plan to test van bodies separately. However, van bodies will be rail impact tested with the prime mover during Phase II PVT. Pull testing of the mounting provisions may be required prior to full-up rail impact testing.*

Question 88D: What is the maximum shipping weight of the M1079A1 van body so a provision analysis can be performed?

Answer 88D: *See Answer 57D above.*

Question 90, Reference ATPD, Page 18 Paragraph # 3.4.1.2

Title: Heavy-Duty Cooling System

Statement: The ATPD says the cooling system shall be capable of continuous de-aeration of 0.1 cfm of air per cylinder at rated speed. Engine suppliers have informed us that this specification is outdated and was originally developed by one of their competitors when 2 cycle engines were the norm. They recommend that the ATPD be revised to require the industry standard requirement of SAE J1436, Requirements for Engine Cooling Systems Filling, Deaeration, and Drawdown Tests.

Question 90: Will the ATPD be updated to reflect SAE J1436?

Answer 90: *No, the ATPD will not be updated. SAE J1436 is the procedure for conducting the drawdown and de-aeration tests, and is referenced in paragraph 4.7.40.*

SAE J1436 does not establish any performance requirements, and therefore should not be referenced in paragraph 3.4.1.2.

Question 91, Reference ATPD, Page 19, 6 Paragraph # 3.4.1.5 and 2.3.5

Title: Air Cleaner & Other Government Documents

Statement: ATPD para 3.4.1.5 states: "The vehicle shall incorporate an inertial type air cleaner system that complies with the requirements of drawing 12414615 and MIL-PRF-62048,…except that the 200 hour durability test shall be met at the rated air flow, which is defined as the air flow of the engine at published engine speed."
ATPD paragraph 2.3.5, Other Government Documents, also requires compliance to TDP drawing 12414615, Air Cleaner, Intake.

Since the air cleaner described on TDP drawing 12414615 does not meet the 200 hour laboratory service life requirement, and considering that the durability and corrosion protection requirements are contained in specific ATPD paragraphs, it is our belief that TDP drawing 12414615 is obsolete and should be removed from ATPD paragraphs 3.4.1.5 and 2.3.5.

Question 91A: Will the ATPD be revised to eliminate compliance to TDP drawing 12414615?

Answer 91A: *No, the exception is noted in the ATPD, which takes precedence over other requirements.*

Question 91B: If the ATPD will not be revised, can the Government specifically define what requirements from TDP drawing 12414615 are to be met?

Answer 91B: *As stated in the requirement paragraph, the air cleaner provided shall meet <u>all</u> the requirements listed on drawing 12424615, with the sole exception that the 200-hour durability test requirement shall be met at an air flow rate equal to that of the engine at the published engine speed.*

Question 92, Reference ATPD, Paragraph # 3.4.14.8

Title: Instruments

Statement: "The vehicle shall be equipped with gauges/indicators which shall be readily visible to the full range of user personnel, adequately lighted for normal operation…"

Question 92: Does this include the air restriction gauge, which is currently not illuminated on the baseline TDP trucks?

Answer 92: *No. Lighting of the air restriction gauge is not required.*

Question 93, Reference ATPD, Paragraph # 3.4.7.3

Title: Windshield Wipers and Washers

Statement: Washer reservoir shall not leak when cab is rotated forward for maintenance. By current design it does leak. This paragraph requires "washer reservoir shall not leak when the cab is rotated forward for maintenance." An ECP was originally approved (Ref SSS-R6812) to address this issue by rotating the reservoir 180°, change the vent port in the reservoir, and provide an o-ring seal for the cap. Investigation confirmed that this change was not possible or implemented into production. The majority of the change with the exception of NOR 6812-5 was cancelled (washer bottle cap change).

Question 93A: Are the competitors expected to develop an alternate change proposal to address this issue or use the baseline design?

Answer 93A: *No, the competitors are not expected to develop any change proposals to address this situation*

Question 93B: Is the proposed new decal P/N 12422559, which specifies the proper fill level or an equivalent decal to be provided?

Answer 93B: *It is assumed the requestor is referring to P/N 12422519 (P/N 12422559 is the Reservoir, Windshield Washer Fluid.). No, the bottle orientation shown on the decal has not been and will not be introduced in production, Decal P/N 12422519 shall not be provided.*

Question 93C: If the baseline reservoir does not leak if it is filled to the proper level (not completely full), would a change be required to meet 3.4.7.3/4.7.58?

Answer 93C: *N/A. See 93A above.*

Question 98, Reference ATPD, Page 63 Paragraph # A.2

Title: General Requirements

Statement: Bed sides shall be a minimum of 18 inches (45 cm) above the floor of the cargo bed and be capable of withstanding lateral and longitudinal forces as exerted by a 2,500 lb (1,134 kg) pallet.

Question 98A: Does the baseline design meet these requirements?

Answer 98A: *Conformance of the baseline vehicles to this requirement has never been tested. This is listed as an objective requirement in the pending ORD/JSOR revision. Once the ORD is approved (Currently at DA for staffing) further definition of this requirement, to include procedures for demonstrating conformance, shall be provided to the Offerors.*

Question 98B: How was the baseline design tested?

Answer 98B: *N/A. See 98A above.*

Question 98C: What acceleration was applied to the 2500 lb. force?

Answer 98C: *N/A. See 98A above.*

Question 99, Reference ATPD, Page 63 Paragraph # A.2

Title: General Requirements

Question 99: What are the requirements for the MTV cargo body to transport ammunition on the highway per Title 49 CFR?

Answer 99: *Please refer to Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations, available via the internet at URL http://www.access.gpo.gov/nara/cfr/cfr-table-search.htm. The complete document is available at that website.*

Question 100, Reference ATPD, Page 78 Paragraph # C.3.1.2.2.2

Title: Power Distribution Panel

Statement: The expansible van body shall be equipped with an interior mounted power distribution panel. The panel shall provide at least the following:

A. Main power on-off control main circuit breaker(s) (24 volt & 110/220).
B. Individual circuit breakers for:…
C. Capability to direct wire equipment into the distribution box space for a minimum of six additional 20 amp circuit breakers (110/220 volt).

The individual parts that make up this requirement are not specified in the TDP. In Electrical Assembly (12441813) there is no mention of the external power inlet/outlet for the 110/208 volt as the LMTV van has, the breaker box is not called out, as well as the individual circuit breakers.

Question 103, Reference ATPD, Page 105 Paragraph # H.3.1.1

Title: Dimensions

Statement:
"Width: The internal width of the LMTV Van body shall be at least 90 inches (228 cm). The overall width of the LMTV Van body shall not exceed 96 inches (244 cm)."

On page four of FMTV Van Body Assembly print (12421503), it shows that the overall width of the van body including the upper rear marker lights is 98.74 inches.

Question 103A:
Are the marker lights to be considered in this maximum width requirement?

Answer 103A: *No, per SAE J 1100, and likewise as stated in paragraph 3.2.2.1 of the ATPD, marker lights are expressly excluded from definition of vehicle width.*

Question 103B: If the marker lights are included in this measurement, are the contractors to develop a change to the van body/marker light configuration to comply with the width requirement?

Answer 103B: *No, the competitors are not expected nor desired to develop any change to the van body/marker lights for this situation, as it complies with the ATPD. See Answer 103A above.*

Question 103C: Can the Government confirm that the current TDP LMTV Van body has been determined to have an acceptable width, with or without marker lights?

Answer 103C: *Yes, the LMTV Van body has been determined to meet the width requirements. See Answer 103A above.*

Question 103D: If the width of the current TDP LMTV Van body is acceptable to the Army, but of a width that conflicts with the ATPD 96 inch width requirement, will the ATPD be amended?

Answer 103D: *As shown on Sheet 4 of Drawing 19207-12421503, the LMTV Van Body width, as defined in both SAE J1100 and ATPD 2131C (Draft) paragraph 3.2.2.1, is 95.55 inches, which falls within the 96.00 maximum limit. No amendment of the ATPD is required.*

Question 104, Reference ATPD, Page 108 Paragraph # H.3.2.7

Title: Heater

Statement: "The van body shall be provided with an externally-mounted 60,000 BTU/HR hot air heater conforming to H.3.3.1. Vehicle 24 VDC shall be supplied for the operation of heater's fuel pump."

The current heater listed in the TDP provided, is a GFE item (NSN 4520-01-203-4410) in kit form that is installed either at the manufacturing facility, or by the customer later. The requirements stated in H.3.2.7 implies this heater is required to be present on all units produced.

Question 104: Will the Government supply this GFE kit for all vehicles that will be produced under this contract?

Answer 104: *No, the Phase II production contractor will be expected to install the heater in all M1079 A1 CR LMTV Vans.*

Question 106, Reference ATPD, Page 116 Paragraph # J.3.2.1

Title: Dimensions

Statement: The overall length of the M1095 trailer is 229.5 inches or 5,829 mm. The length of a pair of M1095 trailers is 459 inches or 11,658 mm which will fit within the 480 inch/12.5 meter length available on a standard C-130 aircraft. To accomplish this, and provide some separation between the two trailers, something other that the primary items tie downs must be used for securing the item inside the aircraft. This is true only when the M1095 trailers are shipped resting on the aircraft floor, as is the case for most modes of air transport.

It is not possible to ship two M1095 trailers configured for Low Velocity Air Drop (LVAD) due to the combined length of the trailers on the air drop platforms or Type V pallets. The next limitation is the orientation of the trailers inside the aircraft to insure proper weight and balance.

It also would not be possible to ship two of the MTV LHS trailers except in a C-130J30 aircraft due to overall length. These trailers are designed to carry flatracks that are nominally 20 feet long with the tongue of the trailer extending beyond the payload.

Question 106A: Are the dimensional requirements to be able to ship to M1095 MTVT's in a C-130 aircraft only applicable to trailers in a non-LVAD configuration?

Answer 106A: *Yes, the dimensional requirements of paragraph J.3.2.1 apply only to non-LVAD configured trailers.*

Question 106B: Will this paragraph be amended to describe the requirements of the LHS trailer or will a separate Annex be added to describe that LHS trailers have unique requirements?

Answer 106B: *The LHS trailer requirements will be addressed in the LHS Trailer Annex that will be included in the specification revision accompanying the final RFP package.*

Question 106C: Will this paragraph be amended to describe the dimensional requirements for shipment of M1082 LMTVT, M1095 MTVT trailers while in LVAD configuration?

Answer 106C: *No, the paragraph will not be revised to address LVAD-configured trailers.*

Question 107, Reference ATPD, Page 116 Paragraph # J.3.2.2.3

Title: Vehicle Payload

Statement: This paragraph requires "Trailer payload shall be at least 5,000 lb. (2,268 kg) for the LMTVT, and a minimum of 10,000 lb. (4,536 kg) for the MTVT."

This definition does not state whether or not certain kits are included/excluded from the payload. For example, the shelter tie down kit is required for some payloads such as the CAMEL or similar fuel/water pods.

Question 107A: Are optional kits such as the cargo cover, shelter tie down, or missile pod shoes included in the minimum payload capacity for the trailers?

Answer 107A: *No, the identified items are considered components of the curb weight of the trailer(s).*

Question 107B: Since the possible payload for the LHS truck/trailer exceed the minimum 10,000 lb. limit, will this paragraph be revised to add the LHS trailer variant?

Answer 107B: *The LHS trailer will have its own Annex.*

Question 108, Reference ATPD, Paragraph # K.3.3

Title: Provision and Storage of Air

Question 108: Can the Government clarify the ATPD statement in paragraph K.3.3 that states "CTIS shall be operable with and without an operable spare tire." ?

Answer 108: *The intent of this requirement is for the vehicle CTI System to operate without degradation when a spare tire, either equipped with an inoperable CTIS wheel valve assembly or not equipped with a CTIS wheel valve at all, is installed on any wheel end tied into the CTI System.*

Question 109, Reference ATPD, Page 127 Paragraph # M.1.1.1

Title: Insulated Enclosures

Statement: The arctic camouflage soft-top kit for the LWB cargo trucks was previously identified as 57K1922. It is currently identified as 57K1929, which is the white arctic cover kit for the LMTV.

Question 109A: What is the correct camouflage arctic cover kit for the LWB (57K1922 or 57K1929)?

Answer 109A: *Kit 57K1922 is the correct camouflage arctic cover kit. We have no record of an arctic kit 57K1929.*

Question 109B: When will drawings for the following kits be provided with the TDP (57K1929, 57K1933, 57K1938, and potentially 57K1922)?

Answer 109B: *The drawings for the kits that are applicable to this contract are included in the TDP CD ROM which was provided with the RFP.*

Question 110, Reference ATPD, Page 127 Paragraph # M.1.2

Title: Cargo Cover Soft Top Kits

Question 110:
When will the drawings for the following soft cover kits (57K1900, 57K1901, 57K1927, 57K1931, 57K1935, 57K1936, 57K1941, 57K1942) be supplied to both competitors?

Answer 110: *The drawings for the kits that are applicable to this contract are included in the TDP CD ROM which was provided with the RFP.*

Question 112, Reference ATPD, Page 128 Paragraph # M.1.9

Title: Troop Seats

Statement: This paragraph required that the "Troop seats shall provided as an optional kit for the standard cargo, long wheel base cargo, and dump trucks. Troop seats shall be provided for at least 12 combat-equipped troops. The troop seat kit shall provide a means for two way communication between troops in the cargo/dump body and those in the vehicle cab."

The current troop seat kit contains an alarm so the occupants can alert the driver if there is a problem in the cargo compartment. This provides one way communication from the bed of the vehicle. It would require minimal changes to incorporate one or two way communication. At a minimum a speaker and a microphone would have to be added for one way communication, twice that for two-way. More information is required to define the design, such as where it needs to be operable from.

Question 112A: Is the intercom operated by pressing a microphone button or is voice activation required?

Answer 112A: *Methods for activating two-way communication are left to the competitor's discretion.*

Question 112B: Is volume control required at the cab and the cargo body positions for tactical operation?

Answer 112B: *Yes, volume control will be required both in the cab and the cargo body.*

Question 112C: Does this system need to operate with or without the ignition being on?

Answer 112C: *Yes, the system shall be operable independent of the state of the vehicle ignition.*

Question 112D: Who will be operating this device in the cab since it would affect placement and configuration?

Answer 112D: *The system shall be operable by personnel seated in any crew position.*

Question 112E: Does the portion of this system need to be able to be removed from the cargo body area when not in use and if so, will a special storage location be required?

Answer 112E: *Yes, the system shall be removable and stowable with the troop seat kit.*

Question 112F: If this system is used without a cargo cover, in inclimate conditions, will it have to be sealed to prevent moisture intrusion during operation?

Answer 112F: *Yes, the system must be environmentally protected.*

Question 112G: Will the government provide a possible location for this device in the cab, since not all of the potential electronic/optional equipment mounting locations have been defined?

Answer 112G: *The location of the device within the cab is left to the competitor's discretion, but should be accessible from any crew station.*

Question 112H: Since the troop seat kit is readily removed/installed on different vehicles, do the interface points (wiring harness routing in the chassis) have to be supplied with all vehicles that could have this kit installed?

Answer 112H: *Yes, interface points must be supplied for all vehicles capable of accepting the troop seat kit(s).*

Question 113, Reference ATPD, Page 128 Paragraph # M.1.10

Title: Trailer Tank and Pump Unit (TPU)

Question 113A: Will details of the 525-gallon and 600-gallon TPU sets and their respective tiedown kits be provided? If so, when might they be available?

Answer 113A: *The ECP to introduce the TPU tiedown kit (SSSU5800) has been approved and will be provided to the Offerors. Kit numbers are as follows:*

525-gallon TPU: 57K2018
600-gallon TPU: 57K2019

Question 113B: Has there been testing to demonstrate that transport of a fully or partially loaded kit will not adversely affect the stability of the M1095 trailer? If so, could the Government provide a copy of the transportability and operational stability test report/results to the offerors?

Answer 113B: *Yes. Stability testing has been performed and the results can be made available at the offerors request (Note: Transportability testing was not conducted as the TPU parameters fall within the previously approved trailer envelope). Release of the final report is pending. It will be provided to the Offerors when available. In the meantime, a copy of the preliminary safety release will be provided with the final RFP.*

Question 113C:
If testing of individual TPU kits with their respective tiedown provisions has been performed, when will the competitors be provided with this?

Answer 113C: ***N/A. See 113A above.***

Question 114, Reference Draft RFP Section C, Paragraph # C.1.2.6

Title: N/A

Statement:
C.1.2.6 "The contractor shall incorporate into the FMTV A1CR Production Configuration TDP baseline and production vehicles only those PPEPs/ECPs/VECPs/RFDs/RFWs that have been approved by the Government and authorized by the PCO." Backround: ECP SSS-R6868 and SSS-U5766 were noted to affect a series of drawings (seven to be exact) where each ECP updated the drawings to the next revision, which happen to be the same letter in both ECP's. In turn, ECP SSS-R6868 was cancelled without notification to the contractors. In addition, ECP SSS-R6812, washer bottle change was noted not to properly fit within the vehicle at the proposed configuration.

Question 114A:

Are RFD's provided with and prior to the RFP intended to be incorporated into the TDP if they are not referenced in a TACOM ECP?

Answer 114A: The RFDs provided as attachment 3 of the Draft RFP should be incorporated into the TDP prior to release of the final RFP, but in the event they are not converted to formal ECPs by the final RFP release date, the RFDs should be treated as if they were formal ECPs to the TDP.

Question 114B: With the recent discovery of cancelled ECP's, can the Government provide a master list of approved ECP's and RFD's that are to be incorporated into the TDP baseline configuration?

Answer 114B: *The TDP provided with the draft RFP completely defines the desired production configuration. Any additional ECPs/RFDs will be incorporated after contract award.*

Question 114C: Will this subject ECP be cancelled from the TDP?

Answer 114C: *ECP SSSR6868 was cancelled at the direction of the government. The ECP had not been incorporated at the time of cancellation therefore there is no need to have it removed from the TDP.*

Question 115, Reference Draft RFP Section C, Paragraph # C.1.2.7 & C.1.2.8

Title: N/A

Statement: C.1.2.7 "Contractor shall submit their contractor Phase II proposed changes for Government Configuration Control Board Evaluation within 60 DAC." C.1.2.8 "PPEPs shall be submitted within 90 DAC."

Question 115A: Does this mean we are required to submit the same ECPs provided in the Phase II proposal at 60 DAC?

Answer 115A: *Yes, however this will be the formal submittal using government numbering systems.*

Question 115B: Does this mean we are required to submit the same PPEPs provided in the Phase II proposal at 90 DAC?

Answer 115B: *Yes.*

Question 116, Reference Draft RFP Section C, Paragraph # C.1.3.4.3 & C.1.3.4.4

Title: Paint

C.1.3.4.3 "Green color 383 (..) Original base coat full coverage."
C.1.3.4.4 "Sand color (..) Original base coat full coverage."

Question 116A: Does this mean that base coat for all parts shall be this color?

Answer 116A: *This means the initial topcoat for all parts shall be this color.*

Question 116B: Can components be pre-painted one color, assembled to the vehicle, then receive a top coat of the desired color?

Answer 116B: *Yes, that process is acceptable.*

Question 118, Reference Draft RFP Section C, Paragraph # C.2.1

Title: Configuration Management

Statement: C.2.1 "Change implementation shall be identified to the part lot, and vehicle serial number." In many instances, components are not lot coded, such as weldments.

Question 118: Are all parts expected to be lot coded under this contact?

Answer 118: *No, however, where part lot identification is not used, the government expects the contractor and it's suppliers to establish and maintain a documented system for identification of components/parts throughout all stages of their production, delivery, and vehicle installation for tracability to a specific vehicle serial number cut-in/cut-out.*

Question 121, Reference Draft RFP Section C, Paragraph # C.2.2.5

Title: Request for Deviation/Waiver

Statement: "Deviations and Waivers shall contain copies of revised Solid Models and affected drawings IAW para. C.2.1.1.1.4 as well as any other supporting data necessary to fully understand the proposal and make a determination. Any RFDs/RFWs, which if approved, would require an increase or decrease to the contract price, shall contain the required cost proposal data and shall be submitted with the RFD/RFW package. The cost proposal data shall be prepared IAW Section I of this contract and contain pricing data to support cost evaluation, negotiation, and an equitable adjustment to the contract."

Question 121A: Attachment 7 states that deviations are "temporary departure from requirements and do not constitute a permanent change to technical data." Since a deviation is not a permanent change, why are 3D-solid models required? The marked up 2D prints should be sufficient to document the temporary change to vehicle configuration.

Answer 121A: *The solid model will show the proposed deviation by its physical characteristics, this data can be helpful to alleviate concerns regarding fit, interference, tolerance stack up, etc. If the change is such that the solid model would provide no added insight, then a marked print would probably be sufficient. However the contractor would run the risk of having a RFD returned for additional supporting documentation if the marked print does not address no- fit or interference concerns.*

Question 121B: Per the language listed in C.2.2.5, RFD's require cost proposal data for changes that would either increase or decrease contact price. Does this mean that under Program Support, RFD's may be processed/submitted against the "no-cost/cost reduction changes" referenced in Paragraph C.2.1.1.1?

Answer 121B: *Paragraph C.2.2.5 will be revised to reflect only no cost or cost reduction changes in the final RFP.)*

Question 122, Reference Draft RFP Section C, Paragraph C.2.3.2

Title: Packaging Development

Statement: Para C.2.3.2 states …The contractor shall develop initial packaging, maintain and update all packaging data for each provisioned item.

Question 122: Can this paragraph be rewritten to exclude common hardware items such as bolts, nuts, washers, clamps, clips, etc., as the contract value added for these common hardware items is limited?

Answer 122: *The provision will be revised in the FinalRFP to read as follows:*

C.2.3.2 Packaging Development. The Contractor shall develop initial packaging, maintain and update all packaging data for items assigned Uniform Source Maintenance and Recoverability (SMR) codes equal to: PA, PB, PC, PE, PG, PH, KF, & KB. Items that will not require packaging development are those items with packaging data already in the TACOM Packaging File called "PACQ" or FEDLOG/FLIS and those assigned a Contractor and Government Entity Code (CAGE) of: 1T416, 21450, 80204, 96906, 10060, 24617, 80205, 99237, 80244, 81343, 81346, 81348, 81349, 81352, 88044. Nor shall initial packaging data be provided if the Contractor's screening of TACOM's Packaging Data Status Report determines that a Level A packaging record is on file. The Government will supply quarterly copies of TACOM's Packaging Data Status Report by e-mail. The contractor shall provide the necessary personnel, facilities, equipment,

material, and the electronic data interface. The contractor shall provide facilities, equipment, materials, and access to the provisioned items for packaging development. The Contractor shall include information for each of the items so TACOM can determine the adequacy of the packaging submittal. This includes item drawings and data such as: Source, Maintenance & Recoverability Codes, Unit of Issue codes, Unit of Measure, Measurement Quantity, and copies of applicable Material Safety Data Sheets. The Contractor shall furnish item drawings and notes sufficient for reviewing the packaging designs in hard copy reproductions or IAW CDRL A008.

Question 133, Reference Draft RFP Section C, Paragraph # C.3

Title: System Technical Support

Statement: Paragraph C.3.1 states: "The Contractor shall use the original FMTV TDP, which will be provided at the Start of Work Meeting as the baseline STS TDP."

Question 133A: What elements make up this baseline STS TDP?

Answer 133A: *The Government's FMTV TDP which consists of all FMTV drawings and associated documents.)*

Question 133B: How is the baseline STS TDP referenced in C.3.1 different from the Government FMTVA1 CR Production Configuration TDP defined in C.1.2.2 and C.1.6.4.1?

Answer 133B: *The Government FMTVA1 CR Production Configuration TDP is the technical documentation of the specific variants which may be produced under the Rebuy Contract. The Government FMTV TDP or baseline STS TDP is ALL the FMTV technical documentation for all FMTV variants A0 and A1.)*

Question 133C: How is the baseline STS TDP referenced in C.3.1 different from the FMTV A1 CR Production Configuration TDP Baseline defined in C.1.2.5?

Answer 133C: *See answer provided for Question 133B above.*
Question 134, Reference Draft RFP Section C, Paragraph # C.3.1

Title: STS

Statement: C.3.1… "The Contractor shall serve as Custodian of the FMTV STS A1/A0 TDP for the duration of the contract. The Contractor shall use the original FMTV TDP, which will be provided at the Start of Work Meeting as the baseline STS TDP."

Question 134A: What format will the "original FMTV TDP" be provided to the contactor in?

Answer 134A: *The original FMTV TDP will be provided in it's native CAD formats (Autocade, Anvil, PRO/E).*

Question 134B: Will the TDP consist of 2D modifiable cad drawings along with a bill of material for each variant in a useable data type such as spreadsheet or ASCII text?

Answer 134B: *See answer provided for question 134A above. The contractor shall have access to ACMS the government's repository for managing the configuration of FMTV.*

Question 134C: If the TDP is provided to the contactor in the same fashion as the prior TDP's (Raster images .C4 format or Adobie .PDF formats), will the Government make available 2D modifiable cad drawings of the complete TDP so that the contactor would not have to re-draw every TDP drawing in order to implement any revision to the cad data?

Answer 134C: *See answers provided for questions 134A and B above.*

Question 137, Reference Draft RFP Section C, Paragraph # C.3.8.3

Title: STS

Statement: "C.3.8.3…..An ERR package shall consist of the revised Pro/ENGINEER Solid model, Pro/ENGINEER 2-D drawing, the ERR, and applicable TD/CMS or ACMS input data for the ECP and ERR."

Question 137: Can the input data parameters required for TD/CMS or ACMS input data be defined and can examples or blank data sheets be provided?

Answer 137: *The reference for TDCMS will be removed from the final RFP. Instructions and training for ACMS will be provided to the contractor. (PAT&E CM)*

Question 138, Reference Draft RFP Section C, Paragraph # C.3.8.4

Title: Engineering Release Record Preparation

Statement: "C.3.8.4 … The Contractor shall prepare one ERR for each approved ECP/VECP/PPEP, initial release of an assembly or ….. If the Contractor was not the ECP preparer the Contractor shall substitute their 'prefix' in front of the ERR number."

Under STS Configuration management C.3.8.4, the contactor shall provide ERRs for each ECP. Under the Program Support Configuration Management (C.2.1), the contactor is not required to provide ERR's for updating revised drawings within ECP's.

Question 138: How are revised mark-up drawings to be updated for the Program Support TDP?

Answer 138: *Updating the drawings or solid model for changes based on any approved ECP will be the contractor's responsibility under the STS portion of the contract.*

Question 139, Reference Draft RFP Section C, Paragraph # C.3.8.5

Title: CSAER

Statement: "C.3.8.5 Configuration Status Accounting & Engineering Records (CSAER)
NOTE: The Government is changing from TDCMS to Automated Configuration Management System (ACMS). Contractors submittal software format for ACMS is being developed by the Government. Contractor's submittal format is to be on-line or batch metadata. Until the contractor's submittal format for ACMS is available, TDCMS will continue to be used. When the ACMS Contractors submittal format is available, the Contractor shall transition to the new format."

Demonstrations and training in data transmission requirements for both systems will allow the contractor to develop submittal software capable of interface with the Government's system.

Question 139: Will the Government provide the contractor demonstrations and training in both TDCMS and ACMS prior to release of the final RFP?

Answer 139: *The reference to TDCMS will be removed from the final RFP. A demonstration of ACMS can be provided to the contractor. The Contractor should contact the PCO to request the demonstration.*

Question 140, Reference Draft RFP Section C, Paragraph # C.3.8.5.1

Title: CSAER Submittal

Statement: "C.3.8.5.1…… CSAER Submittal & Validation - Contractor's quality provisions shall assure that accurate and complete CSAER computer input data is provided. This CSAER data, also referred to as 'TDCMS ENCODING', will be generated as a result of instructions for CSAER computer input preparation as described in CDRL A073, OT-89-12345C(T)."

OT-89-12345C(T) is not referenced in CDRL A073**.**

Question 140A: What is meant by "OT-89-12345C(T)?"

Answer 140A: *The reference to TDCMS will be removed from the final RFP. Therefore the DID OT-89-12345C(T) will be removed as well.*

Question 140B: If this is a document describing the data requirements for CSAER, could the government provide document OT-89-12345C(T) to the contractors?

Answer 140B: *See answer provide above.*

Question 148, Reference Draft RFP Sections A & M, Paragraphs A.1.1; M.1.2; M.7.1 (b)

FMTV Competitive Rebuy Acquisition Strategy
A.1.1 states *that: "only competitors who have successfully completed a Phase I contract will be eligible to compete for the Phase II contract."* M.1.2 states "*that proposals will be evaluated on an Acceptable/Unacceptable basis considering…Completion of Phase I Testing."* M.7.1 (b) mentions *"successful achievement of Phase I Exit Criteria.*

Question 148A: Are there any other exit criteria in addition to the completion of 20,000 miles or 7 months testing?

Answer 148A: *There are no other exit criteria.*

Question 148B: As test performance is being represented as a preliminary evaluation of system performance, our position is that the results of Phase I testing be included and scored as part of the Technical System Performance volume?

Answer 148B: *Unclear as to what the question is, however, Phase I test results will be used to determine if the met the systems level performance requirements as specified in section M.7.2.6 of the RFP.*

Question 157, Reference Draft RFP C.1.2.6
This paragraph states: *"The contractor shall incorporate into… production vehicles…only PPEPs/ECPs/VECPs/RFDs/RFWs …approved by the Government and authorized by the PCO."*

Can the contractor propose changes to the production vehicle after Phase II source selection that would, if approved, result in a contractor producing a vehicle configuration for PVT other than the configuration that comprised the basis for source selection?

Answer 157: *The contractor may submit proposed changes after contract award per paragraph C.2.1.1.1.*

Question 158, Reference Draft RFP C.1.7.2.b

States that ILS to include Vehicle Refurbishment. Para C.2.7.5 Dedicated ILS Hardware states that after the production hardware is no longer needed, the contractor will refurbish it and deliver it 30 days after TM delivery for fielding. Para C.2.8 Vehicle Refurbishment states that the trucks will be refurbished to like new condition.

Is the 10/20 standard acceptable? If not please clarify standard.

Answer 158: *10/20 standard is not acceptable. Paragraphs C.2.7.5 and C.2.8 will be revised for the Final RFP. This effort will be done under STS.*

Question 159, Reference Draft RFP C.1.7.3

"STS consists of separate cost reimbursement CLINs for this production contract." "The Contractor shall serve as custodian of the FMTV TDP for the duration of this contract." "STS includes but is not limited to Government-directed ECPs in support of fielded A1/A0 vehicles, Logistics effort in support of Government-directed ECPs, the Expansible Van and LHS, Maintenance Technical Representatives (MTRs)."

The Draft RFP does not require the Offeror to demonstrate their capability to perform these functions. This Draft Phase-II RFP focuses on Unit Production Costs and ECPs associated only with the A1CR vehicle. How will the Army extrapolate from the narrow scope of evaluating individual ECPs and Unit Production Costs to entrusting support of the fielded fleet, without evaluation criteria? Will a scored ILS Volume be added to the Phase II proposal submission?

Answer 159: *There will be no separate ILS volume, since both competitors have demonstrated ILS expertise, and paragraph H.17 provides incentives for ILS to receive staffing and management attention. Both competitors are judged to have expertise developing and supporting fielding requirements. Further expertise and staffing for supporting FMTV A1CR would be expected to be developed as this work effort ramps up to support fielding.*

In Phase I, the ILS impacts were evaluated separately. In Phase II, ILS will be evaluated under Life Cycle Costs and Technical-System Performance Areas. In the LCC Area, only ILS impacts related to proposed ECPs will be evaluated. In the Technical-System Performance Area, ILS impacts on the entire vehicle system will be evaluated. After contract award, the winning Phase II Contractor may offer, for Government review, additional cost reduction proposals (Value Engineering Change Proposals) beyond the

scope of the Phase II contract but they will not be part of the Phase II source selection process.

The ILS Support and System Technical Support will be evaluated IAW L.6.1

Question 160. Reference Draft RFP C.2.1.1.1.2

Is there now a requirement for the FMTV A1 CR to be downward compatible with the A0?

Answer 160: *It is desired that the A1 CR vehicle be downward compatible to the A0 to the maximum extent possible.*

Question 161, Reference Draft RFP C.2.2.2; L.2.2.3; L.5.1

Section C.2.2.2 is referenced in Section L.2.2.3 for the Executive Summary and in Section L.5.1 for the Technical – System Performance Area. Does this mean that DD Form 1692, DD Form 1695, and DD Form 1696 should be in both volumes?

Answer 161: *In the Executive summary the Offeror need only provide a matrix of the proposed ECPs, the top level ECP information (DD Form 1692) and a general summary of what each ECP is and what it is expected to accomplish. A complete ECP package, to include supporting data, shall be provided as part of Volume 4, Technical -System Performance Area, L.5*

Question 163, Reference Draft RFP C.2.2.5

There appears to be three conflicting requirements for submitting PPEPs/ECPs/VECPs/RFDs/RFWs:

- C.2.2.5 Any RFDs /RFWs which if approved would require an increase or decrease to the contract price shall contain the required cost proposal data and shall be submitted with the RFD/RFW package
- C.2.1.1 Only no cost/cost reduction changes will be generated under the Program Support CLINs of this contract.
- C.1.7.2.B PPEPs/ECPs/VECPs/RFDs/RFWs –no cost if implementation does not exceed 10K

Please clarify the requirements for submitting PPEPs/ECPs/VECPs/RFDs/RFWs.

Answer 163: *Paragraph C.2.2.5 will be revised to remove the reference to cost increase RFDs.*

C.1.7.2B establishes a window for "NO COST" changes. Any change whose cost increase or decrease is within plus or minus $10,000.00 is considered to be a NO COST submittal. See paragraph H.16 of the RFP.

Question 167, Reference Draft RFP C.2.5.11 – C.2.5.11.4

Component First Article Testing
Why conduct *CFAT* on components unchanged from FMTV A1 that demonstrated no problems in Phase 1 Testing?

Answer 167: *Refer to Paragraph C.2.5.11.11 for coverage of the condition described in your question.*

Question 168, Reference Draft RFP C.2.5.11.1

Please clarify whether Item 9, refers to air and hydraulic oil reservoirs and fuel tanks, or does it refer only to air and hydraulic oil reservoirs?

Answer 168: *Our intent is Air, hydraulic oil or fuel tanks/reservoirs. The change will be incorporated in the finalRFP.*

Question 169, Reference Draft RFP C.2.5.11.8

Conflicting guidance. The first sentence states that FA units shall be taken from the first 10 units produced. The second sentence states that the government can select the FA units from any lot of 10. Please clarify.

Answer 169: *The last sentence will be changed to read: "The Government reserves the right to select the First Article from any lot of 10 units."*

Question 170, Reference Draft RFP C.2.5.16.9

Should "differences" be "deficiencies"?

Answer 170: *Yes, the paragraph will be changed accordingly.*

Question 171, Reference Draft RFP C.2.5.2.2

C.2.5.2.2 references final approval of FPVI not until after successful completion of PVT. Should this be final approval of First Article Test, rather than final approval of FPVI??

Answer 171: *No, the RFP is correct as written.*

Question 173, Reference Draft RFP C.2.5.9.5

The Developmental Test Command has been developing a Virtual Proving Ground capability that can simulate testing under various conditions and test ranges. In addition to access to TIRs and FACARs, are there any Virtual Proving Ground applications that can be made available for pre-test analysis?

Answer 173*: None that we are aware of at this time. However, as virtual applications become available we will support contractor requests if possible.*

Question 175, Reference Draft RFP C.2.9.1.1

States that the IETM will adhere to the content requirements of MIL-STD-40051A.

The FMTV IETM's were well into development when the specification was modified to its existing data. TACOM and TVS were given a waiver on meeting this requirement at the time of delivery. This waiver has been extended to the current Change-1 effort that is currently underway. However, the structure will have to be reformatted to meet this specification. Is this the government's intent?

Answer 175: *It is not our intent to reformat the IETM. TACOM's officially established IETM software, EMS2, exceeds the requirements of MIL-STD-40051.*

Question 176, Reference Draft RFP C.2.9.5.4.1

States "after government acceptance of the product, the government reserves the right to require the contractor to ask the contractor for a correction?

What duration of time does the government have to exercise this option? Does the 15 days include reshipping and receipt of the documents?

Answer 176: *In this case, Government "acceptance" of the product should be considered "receipt" of the product. The Government may exercise this right during the Government review cycle of the validated/verified manuscript prior to delivery of FDEP.*

The 15 day timeframe includes the time from notification of an error in the manuscript to the time the corrected text is postmarked by the postal service. Yes, it includes reshipping, but not receipt by the Government. Getting it to the post office or shipping agency on the 15th day satisfies the requirement. The statement of work will be updated with this definition in the final RFP.

Question 177, Reference Draft RFP E.6; ATPD 3121 /C 5.3

Paragraph E.6 requires the contractor to ship each vehicle from the plant with 25 gallons of fuel.

ATPD 2131 C paragraph 5.3 requires that "prior to loading vehicles for sea or air shipments, vehicles shall contain ¼ tank of fuel…" Please clarify whether the requirement is 25 gallons of fuel or ¼ tank of fuel.

Answer 177: *Paragraph E.6 will be changed to read "1/4 tank of fuel" in the final RFP.*

Question 183, Reference Draft RFP H.9.4.3

Are 4 trucks being subjected to ACT each Program Year, or 4 total?

Answer 183: *Up to four trucks each program year*

Question 188, Reference Draft RFP L.2.2.1

What does "referenced to the Government FMTV A1 CR production configuration" mean?

Answer 188: *The listing or matrix will identify by ECP the affected parts or documents within the Government FMTV A1 CR production Configuration.*

Question 189, Reference Draft RFP L.2.2.2

What is the meaning of a system and major sub-system, as mentioned in paragraph L.2.2.2? Does it mean a sub-system as dictated by the government Work Breakdown Structure, or Attachment 31, or is it Contractor defined?

Answer 189: *This is Contractor defined, however, the Attachment 31 serves as a good design guide.*

Question 194, Reference Draft RFP L.5

In addition to evaluating Element 1- Band 1, Element 2 – Band 2, and Element 3 – Band 3 will the Technical Volume also include an evaluation of each competitor's technical approach, competencies and ability?

Answer 194: *Yes. These factors will go into the risk factor assigned to each element.*

Question 195, Reference Draft RFP L.5

This paragraph requires each ECP to be submitted on separate disk. How many copies of each of the ECP disks are required?

Answer 195: *Six copies (One for each paper copy of Volume 4) shall be submitted. The final RFP will be amended.*

Question 211, Reference: Attachment 6

In Attachment 6 Block 37 references "Attachment A sample form," and Block 38 references "Appendix B sample form". Will these documents be provided in the final RFP?

Answer 211: *The forms should have been provided with the RFP. The forms will be made available and included in the final RFP*

Question 227, Reference: Attachment 36

Attachment 36 has no ATPD reference or test method for the fourth item down in Element 1 – Band 1. There are several items in the spec which address angles. To which item in the spec does this particular item is refer?

Answer 227: *This is a typographical error. It should be included with the box on the third row down and read "approach/departure angle". Requirement applies to 3.2.1.15. The final RFP will be amended.*

Question 228, Reference Draft RFP M.7.1
Phase I performance – acceptable/not acceptable

Are A1 CR OMFs the only items counted in the evaluation?

Answer 228: *The question is not understood. Paragraph M.7.1 specifies "successful achievement of phase 1 exit criteria." There is no reference to "performance" or "OMFs". Please clarify.*

Question 229, Reference Draft RFP L.5

Are FACARs due prior to assessment conference or in the Phase II Proposal?

If included in the Phase II Proposal, are the A1 CR TIRs the only ones that require FACAR submission in the Phase II Proposal.

Answer 229: *Please refer to Phase 1 contract paragraph C.6.6.2 and attachment 56 paragraphs 3c and 3d.*

Question 231, Reference Draft RFP, Paragraph C.1.6.6

Waiver and all other references to waivers – Mil-HDBK-61A, which is referenced in section C, states that the government no longer uses the term waiver for a nonconformance and uses the term deviation for all cases of a nonconformance.

Answer 231: *This is accurate statement. However as we are still transitioning from MIL-STD-973 to MIL-HDBK-61A on the FMTV program we identified both to offset confusion or questions.*

Question 233, Reference Attachment 1 ATPD 3121C, Paragraph 3.2.9.1

Water Resistance – Is this requirement over and above the current requirements of the cab and its components? If so, this could be a significant design change to make everything waterproof.

Answer 233: *Yes, the requirement has been made more stringent than was required under previous ATPD versions, however we believe the required level of performance is well within commercial state-of-the-art.*

Question 234, Reference Draft RFP, C.2.2.5 Request for Deviation/Waiver

Recommend that DCMA be included in review cycle prior to submission to TACOM with comments and recommendations. Many errors that are minor but require resubmission could be caught at DCMA

Answer 234: *The contractor should not rely on the Government to be a quality control point for errors on CDRL submissions. DCMC operates on very lean staffs. The contractor is responsible to establish an RFD/RFW process that results in quality CDRL submissions.*

Question 235, Reference Draft RFP, C.2.5.2.1-- (Last Sentence)

On FPVI vehicles does that mean the contractor has to furnish records that date back to R001, and all previous contracts that included FPVI ? Many of these records are stored who knows were, if at all, and if it was four years following last delivery, do they need to provide them? Also is it fair to request this from the FMTV -TVS folks when the Oshkosh folks do not have date for FMTV FPVI?) Just curious

Answer 235: *The records referenced in the last sentence of C.2.5.2.1 are those records associated with FPVI vehicles produced under this contract only.*

Question 236, Reference Draft RFP, C.5.11.8-- Last sentence

Recommend following change- The First Article **Will** be selected by the Government from any lot of 10 Units.

Answer 236: *The Government assumes the recommendation is for C.2.5.11.8. The sentence is correct as written.*

Question 237, Reference Draft RFP, C.2.5.11.10

The approved Component First Article **Will Not** Serve as manufacturing Standard. It was perceived that the purpose of the approved First Article was to provide a standard for future manufacturing.

Answer 237: *Agree, the paragraph will be deleted in the final RFP.*

Question 238, Reference ATPD2131C, 3.2.1,1

Recommend change to read from - In Both to In Either forward or reverse - backing over the 60% slope, could be a safety issue.

Answer 238: *The requirement will not be changed. The "In both" requirement existed in the "B" version of the ATPD (Phase 1).*

Question 239, Reference ATPD2131C, 3.2.2.3.6

Non-Skid Surfaces- Are all walkways, working surfaces, steps required to be non-skidded? What about working surfaces in particular? Working surfaces would include things like the Tractor and wrecker platforms which are manufactured with lots of holes and non skidding difficult to apply.

Answer 239: *All walkways, working surfaces, and steps are required to be provided with non-skid protection. This does not necessarily mean these surfaces need be covered with MIL-W-5044 Walking Compound. Use of expanded metal or treadplate is an acceptable alternative, as referenced in the TDP for the M1088A1 Tractor and M1089A1 Wrecker.*

Question 240, Reference ATPD2131C, 3.2.9.1

When assembled, is the cab and all components required to be waterproof? Is this applicable for all models?

Answer 240: *Yes, the cab, as an assembly and for all variants, (and the components thereof) is to be water resistant to the extent specified in Paragraph 4.7.32.1. of the ATPD.*

Question 243, Reference:: ATPD, Page 16 Paragraph # 3.2.9.1

Title: Water Resistance

Statement: This paragraph requires that "Vapor material shall be applied to prevent the accumulation of condensation on the interior of the cab."

Question 243A: Since the Vapor material is a new requirement to the ATPD, is there a drawing that defines the properties of the material and where it is to be applied?

Answer 243A: *No, the type and material of vapor barrier will be left to the competitor's discretion.*

Question 243B: Is there an approved ECP or deviation that adds this to the baseline configuration?

Answer 243B: *No, the competitors will be required to propose a new ECP in their Phase II proposal to accomplish this.*

Question 243C: If there is a required life for the vapor material (i.e. during storage and initial shipment) and if there is one, what is it?

Answer 243C: *No, there is not a specific life requirement for the vapor barrier material.*

Question 243D: If the material is currently in use and a life requirement is applicable, can documentation please be provided that demonstrates that the requirement is met?

Answer 243D: *Vapor materials are currently incorporated into the walls of the Van bodies. No life requirement is specified for that material. See Answer 243C.*

Question 243E: If this vapor material is not currently part of an approved ECP, is it a new mandatory change that both competitors are expected to provide as part of the Phase II proposal?

Answer 243E: *Yes. See Answer 243B above.*

Question 244, Reference ATPD, Page 25, Paragraph # 3.4.17
Title: Rifle Mount

Statement: This paragraph requires the following "Vehicles shall be provided with racks/mounts inside the cab for three (3) M16A2/M4 rifles with and without the following accessories attached:

a. M203 Grenade Launcher
b. 30 round clip
c. Blank adapter
d. Flash Adapter
e. Miles Adapter**"**

Question 244A: When will the Government provide outline drawings and sufficient information on the following items (M203 Grenade Launcher, Flash Adapter, and Miles

Adapter) so that a verification can be performed to determine if the interface requirements are met?

Answer 244A: *A new weapons stowage system has been developed and verified under the FMTV A1 STS contract which will accommodate the weapons with the identified accessories attached. A copy of the ECP (SSSU5814) has been provided to both Offerors.*

Question 244B: If the Government cannot provide details on these components, will they provide documentation that the new rifle storage bracket will accept a weapon that incorporates one or more of these items?

Answer 244B: *See Answer 244A above.*

Question 244C: If details of these items cannot be provided and an interface verification of the new kit accommodates a weapon with any of these features, will the requirement be removed from the ATPD or deferred to after Phase II award?

Answer 244C: *No. See Answer 244A above.*

Question 245, Reference ATPD, Page 26, Paragraph # 4.1.6

Title: Quality Assurance Provisions

Statement: All components or parts, incorporated into final end items, shall have the manufactures recommended "break in"/"run in" requirements, performed by either the contractor or subcontractor, prior to offering the final end item Government acceptance.

Question 245: Will the Government provide a master list of baseline TDP parts that have special or unusual "break in/run in" requirements?

Answer 245: *No. It is the contractor's responsibility to obtain this information from their suppliers in order to meet the requirements of 4.1.6.*

Question 251, Reference ATPD, Page 129, Paragraph # M.1.11

Title: Digitization Kits

Statement: Sheet 3 of the master kit drawing 12422040 identifies the Digitization Electrical Kit as 57K2013. The reference stated in paragraph M.1.11 refers to this kit as 57K2019. A review of the drawings provided with the approved ECPs confirms that the correct reference should be 57K2013.

Question 251A: Will paragraph M.1.11 be revised to reflect the correct kit number for the Digitization Electrical Kit 57K2013?

Answer 251A: *Yes. Thank you for pointing out the error. The correct kit number (57K2013) will be referenced in the specification update that will accompany the final RFP.*

Question 260: Reference Draft RFP, Paragraph # C.2.5.2

Title: First Production Vehicle Inspection (FPVI)

Statement: Paragraph C.2.5.2.1 states: "The FPVI shall be initiated at least 60 days prior to the start of the PVT and shall be completed prior to the shipment of the PVT vehicles to the Government test sites."

Typically, FPVI does not require 60 days to complete.

Question 260: Will the Government consider moving the FPVI closer to the start date of the PVT?

Answer 260: *No. It is our experience that the complete FPVI process takes at least 60 days. This also allows time for implementation of corrective actions prior to the start of PVT.*

Question 261, Reference Draft RFP, Paragraph # C.2.5.11

Title: Component First Article Testing (CFAT)

Statement: As part of First Article Requirements, the Government requires CFAT on the components and systems listed in Paragraph C.2.5.11.1. Since the Government has also identified several variants that will undergo extensive RAM-D/Performance testing during PVT, the requirement for CFAT would seem redundant as the components tested during CFAT would also be extensively tested during PVT. Additionally, the Government would incur significant expenses associated with CFAT.

Question 261A: Can the Government explain the rationale behind the requirement for CFAT when the components will also be tested during PVT?

Answer 261A: *CFATs provide for component level testing IAW requirements of drawings, specifications, performance requirements, and standards. PVT is a system level test which does not specifically perform the required tests/data collection required at the component level.*

Question 261B: Will the Government consider reducing the number of components required to undergo CFAT or remove the requirement for CFAT altogether?

Answer 261B: *No, See answer above.*

Question 261C: Assuming that the component is unchanged from the product baseline, will the winning contractor be required to re-qualify it as part of a new CFAT?

Answer 261C: *Please refer to paragraph C.2.5.11.11 (Component First Article Conditions).*

Question 267, Reference Draft RFP, Paragraph # E.3.2

Title: Quality Program

Question 267:
E.3.2 - Will generic quality system procedures for the development, implementation, and maintenance of control plans satisfy this paragraph or must the procedures be specifically written for FMTV products?

Answer 267: *The Government would prefer quality procedures that focus on the FMTV product line, however, generic system level procedures may be used as long as they are clearly documented as applicable to FMTV and meet all other contract quality requirements.*

Question 268, Reference Draft RFP, Paragraph # E.3.2.1

Title: Quality Program

Question 268: E.3.2.1 – Is this paragraph mandating the review of each and every supplier's quality system?

Answer 268: *Yes.*

Question 269, Reference Draft RFP, Paragraph # E.3.2.2

Title: Quality Program

Question 269: E.3.2.2 – Is this paragraph mandating the formation of a cross functional team with every supplier of FMTV parts?

Answer 269*: Yes.*

Question 270, Reference Draft RFP, Paragraph # E.5.1

Title: Final Acceptance

Statement: Paragraph E.5.1 states "Deficiencies disclosed during inspection by the Contractor or the Government shall be described in writing on the Deficiency Sheet attached to the FIR.

Question 270: Does the deficiency sheet have to be physically attached to the FIR? Can the Deficiency Sheet be inserted into the "Customer Sales Order" package along with the FIR, but not physically attached?

Answer 270: *The Government would prefer that the deficiency sheet be attached to the FIR to minimize the possibility of having it misplaced or lost.*

Question 272, Reference Draft RFP, Paragraph # E.9

Title: Care and Storage of Conditionally and Finally Accepted Vehicles Prior to Shipment

Statement: Paragraph E.9 sentence number two states: "To assure that the vehicles remain in an acceptable condition, the contractor shall develop a storage exercise and maintenance plan and submit IAW CDRL A083."

Question 272: What are the requirements for the term "acceptable condition"? Vehicles in storage will exhibit normal wear and tear from exercise activity, aging and weather conditions. Does "acceptable condition" consider these variables, or is the expectation to have a "new condition" vehicle for shipment?

Answer 272: *Vehicles will be of "like new" condition except for normal wear and tear associated with exercise activity, aging, and weather conditions.*